

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated September 21, 2007, the Examiner objects to claims 1, 13, 20, and 34 because of alleged informalities; rejects claims 1, 13, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention; rejects claims 1, 4-21, 23-26, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,950,876 to Bright et al. (hereinafter "BRIGHT") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,197,125 to Prasad et al. (hereinafter "PRASAD"); rejects claims 2, 3, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over BRIGHT in view of PRASAD, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,237,025 to Albert (hereinafter "ALBERT"); rejects claims 27 and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over PRASAD in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0137991 to Doshi (hereinafter "DOSHI"); and rejects claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over PRASAD in view of DOSHI, and further in view of ALBERT. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.¹

By way of the present amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 9-13, 16, 18-19, and 34 to improve form. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-34 are pending.

Claims 1, 13, 20, and 34 stand objected to because of alleged informalities.

Applicants respectfully traverse these objections.

¹ As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

The Examiner objected to claim 1 because of the extra word 'device' (Office Action, p. 2). Applicants have amended claim 1 to remove this word.

The Examiner also objected to claim 1 for allegedly not including a structure linking the agents, as recited in claim 1, with the at least one resolver, as recited in claim 1 (Office Action, p. 2). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegation. Claim 1 recites that "the resolver performing the identification of the network resources in accordance with a resolution process determined based on the information collected by the agents." Therefore, there is a clear relationship between the resolver and the agents in claim 1.

The Examiner's allegation that there is no explicit structure linking the at least one resolver to the agents is directed to the breadth of the claim, and not to the indefiniteness of the claim. It is black letter patent law that the breadth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness. *In re Miller*, 441 F.2d 689, 169 USPQ 597 (CCPA 1971). See also M.P.E.P. § 2173.04. Additionally, a fundamental principle contained in 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is that Applicants are their own lexicographers and may "define in the claims what they regard as their invention essentially in whatever terms they choose as long as any special meaning assigned to a term is clearly set forth in the specification." M.P.E.P. § 2173.01. Applicants respectfully submit that the features of the claims at issue have been broadly defined, as clearly permitted under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's objection to claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to claim 20 for allegedly not including a structure linking the gateway, as recited in claim 20, and the NIC, as recited in claim 20 (Office Action, p. 2). The Examiner objected to claim 34 for allegedly not including a structure between the “means for collecting information”, as recited in claim 34, and the “means for identifying”, as recited in claim 34. Applicants submit that the Examiner's allegations regarding these claims go to the breadth of the claims and not to indefiniteness.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's objection to claims 20 and 34 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 13, 20, and 34 because the preamble of these claims allegedly fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention, making the preamble too vague and general (Office Action, p. 2). Applicants submit the Examiner's allegations lack merit.

Applicants may define the preamble of a claim as broadly as Applicants desire. If this objection is maintained, Applicants request that the Examiner explain under what authority the Examiner raises this objection.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's objection to the preamble of claims 1, 13, 20, and 34 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 13, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleged that claim 13 does not recite how to obtain “information that identifies the subscriber”, as recited in claim 13, making claim 13 vague and indefinite (Office Action, p. 3). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's allegation.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's allegation is again directed to the breadth of the claim, and not to the indefiniteness of the claim.

For example, claim 13 recites a method implemented in a network comprising collecting information pertaining to a plurality of different network devices via a set of collection agents, identifying one of the plurality of different network devices as a network device that provides services to a subscriber of the network based on information that identifies the subscriber and based on the collected information, and specifying a path from the information that identifies the subscriber to the network device. Applicants submit that this claim is definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. The Examiner's allegation that the claim does not recite how to obtain “information that identifies the subscriber” goes to the breadth of the claim and the indefiniteness of the claim.

Applicants have broadly recited identifying a network device as a network device that provide services to a subscriber of the network based on information that identifies the subscriber and based on the collected information. The Examiner's allegation that not reciting how to obtain “information that identifies the subscriber” makes the claim vague and indefinite lacks merit.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 13 is definite and satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 34 for the same rationale as claim 13 above (Office Action, p. 3). Applicants submit that claims 1 and 34 are definite and satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-21, 23-26, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over BRIGHT in view of PRASAD. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed to one or more devices in a network that includes agents configured to collect information relating to other devices in the network; and at least one resolver configured to identify, based on identification information of a subscriber, a network resource that manage elements associated with the subscriber to implement network services for the subscriber, the resolver performing the identification of the network resource in accordance with a resolution process determined based on the information collected by the agents, the resolution process specifying a path from the identification information of the subscriber to the network resource. BRIGHT and PRASAD, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, BRIGHT and PRASAD do not disclose or suggest at least one resolver configured to identify, based on identification information of a subscriber, a network resource that manages elements associated with the subscriber to implement network services for the subscriber, the resolver performing the identification of the network resource in accordance with a resolution process determined based on the information collected by the agents, the resolution process specifying a path from the identification information of the subscriber to the network resource, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner admits that BRIGHT does not disclose this feature (Office Action, p. 4). The Examiner relies on lines 6-15 of the abstract of PRASAD, the authentication server depicted in Fig. 1 of PRASAD, and on Fig. 4A, elements 4-005 to 4-011 of PRASAD for allegedly disclosing the above feature (Office Action, p. 4-5). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of PRASAD.

Lines 6-15 of the abstract of PRASAD discloses:

The directory-enabled service selection framework receives a request to identify one or more services to which a subscriber is subscribed, based on a prior request to modify the subscription of the subscriber to the telecommunications service. A list is generated of the one or more services to which the subscriber is currently subscribed, based on group membership of the subscriber, one or more roles occupied by the subscriber, and authorization information associated with the subscriber that is stored in the directory repository.

This section of PRASAD discloses that a request by a subscriber to modify a subscription leads to the generation of a list of services to which the subscriber is currently subscribed, based on such factors as the group membership of the subscriber, one or more roles occupied by the subscriber, and authorization information associated with a subscriber. This section of PRASAD does not disclose or suggest, for example, a resolution process specifying a path from the identification information of the subscriber to a network

resource (where the network resource manages elements associated with the subscriber to implement network services for the subscriber), as recited in claim 1. Therefore, this section of PRASAD cannot disclose or suggest at least one resolver configured to identify, based on identification information of a subscriber, a network resource that manage elements associated with the subscriber to implement network services for the subscriber, the resolver performing the identification of the network resource in accordance with a resolution process determined based on the information collected by the agents, the resolution process specifying a path from the identification information of the subscriber to the network resource, as recited in claim 1.

Fig. 1 of PRASAD depicts authentication server 106, which is a RADIUS (Remote Authentication Dial In User Service) server that is primarily used for user authentication (see col. 6, lines 26-27 of PRASAD). The Examiner appears to rely on authentication server 106 for allegedly corresponding to the at least one resolver configured to identify, based on identification information of a subscriber, a network resource that manage elements associated with the subscriber to implement network services for the subscriber (Office Action, p. 4). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's allegation. Authentication server 106 is used primarily for user authentication (col. 6, lines 26-27 of PRASAD).

Furthermore, authentication server 106 is not configured to identify a resolution process specifying a path from the identification information of the subscriber to the network resources that manage elements associated with the subscriber. For at least these reasons, authentication server 106 disclosed by PRASAD cannot correspond to at least

one resolver configured to identify, based on identification information of a subscriber, a network resource that manage elements associated with the subscriber to implement network services for the subscriber, the resolver performing the identification of the network resource in accordance with a resolution process determined based on the information collected by the agents, the resolution process specifying a path from the identification information of the subscriber to the network resource, as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner further relies on Fig. 4A, elements 4-005 to 4-011 of PRASAD for allegedly disclosing a resolution process specifying a path from the identification information of the subscriber to the network resource (Office Action, p. 5).

Fig. 4A of PRASAD depicts a flow diagram showing a process of carrying out a service logon (col. 3, lines 35-36 of PRASAD). Item 4-005 of Fig. 4A of PRASAD shows the step of performing an authorization check based on information in a privilege token and responding with results; item 4-006 of Fig. 4A of PRASAD shows that an error message is generated if the user is not authorized to access the service; item 4-007 of Fig. 4A of PRASAD shows the step of receiving a service logon request; item 4-008 of Fig. 4A of PRASAD shows requesting service information; item 4-009 of Fig. 4A of PRASAD shows responding with service information; item 4-010 of Fig. 4A of PRASAD shows responding to read service request; and item 4-011 of Fig. 4A of PRASAD shows engaging the service for the user and responding to the service logon request. Fig. 4A of PRASAD does not disclose or suggest a resolution process specifying a path from the identification information of the subscriber to the network resource. Instead, Fig. 4A of PRASAD depicts the steps in a logon process. Fig. 4A of PRASAD

cannot, therefore, disclose or suggest at least one resolver configured to identify, based on identification information of a subscriber, a network resource that manage elements associated with the subscriber to implement network services for the subscriber, the resolver performing the identification of the network resource in accordance with a resolution process determined based on the information collected by the agents, the resolution process specifying a path from the identification information of the subscriber to the network resource, as recited in claim 1.

With regard to motivation, the Examiner alleges (Office Action, p. 5):

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Bright and Prasad to provide the system of Prasad a plurality of agents to collect information from different services, therefore providing different services to the users.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Furthermore, it is unclear how one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to combine elements 211-221 from Fig. 2 of BRIGHT (which the Examiner alleged correspond to the agents as recited in claim 1 (Office Action, p. 4)) with authentication server 106 from Fig. 1 of PRASAD (which the Examiner alleged correspond to the at least one resolver as recited in claim 1). If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner explain how such an alleged combination would function.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on BRIGHT and PRASAD be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 4-12 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on BRIGHT and PRASAD be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Moreover, these claims are patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD for reasons of their own. For example, claim 5 recites that a resolution process generates a resolution graph defined by vertices and edges, where the vertices represent network data types used by resolvers and the edges represent resolvers that can perform a mapping from the data type represented by a source vertex to a data type represented by a destination vertex. The Examiner relies on Fig. 4A of PRASAD and col. 12, line 21 to col. 13, line 36 of PRASAD, as well as col. 10, lines 45-57 of PRASAD for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, p. 9). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of PRASAD.

Col. 12, line 21 to col. 13, line 36 of PRASAD, which describe Fig. 4A of PRASAD, disclose a process of service logon. The steps in the process include selecting a service, receiving a service request, providing a privilege token, verifying an authorization system, generating an error message if the user is not authorized to access the service, receiving a service logon, requesting service information, responding with the service information, responding to the read service request, and engaging the selected service. This section of PRASAD does not disclose or suggest a resolution graph.

Therefore, this section of PRASAD cannot disclose or suggest that a resolution process generates a resolution graph defined by vertices and edges, where the vertices represent network data types used by resolvers and the edges represent resolvers that can perform a mapping from the data type represented by a source vertex to a data type represented by a destination vertex, as recited in claim 5.

Col. 10, lines 45-57 of PRASAD disclose a login process that is carried out when a user connects over a PPP connection. The service selection gateway constructs a RADIUS ACCESS REQUEST message and sends it to the authentication server. The authentication server returns either an ACCESS ACCEPT or ACCESS REJECT message. This section of PRASAD does not disclose or suggest a resolution graph. Therefore, this section of PRASAD cannot disclose or suggest that a resolution process generates a resolution graph defined by vertices and edges, where the vertices represent network data types used by resolvers and the edges represent resolvers that can perform a mapping from the data type represented by a source vertex to a data type represented by a destination vertex, as recited in claim 5.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 5 is not patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Independent claim 13 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 13 is patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

request that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on BRIGHT and PRASAD be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 14-19 depend from claim 13. Therefore, these claims are patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on BRIGHT and PRASAD be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 20 is directed to a system that includes a gateway configured to receive network service requests from or on behalf of subscribers in a network, at least some of the service requests requiring configuration of one or more network elements to satisfy the service request, a network information collector (NIC) configured to identify a management entity associated with the one or more network elements required to satisfy the service request, the NIC including a plurality of agents configured to collect information relating to a state of a plurality of network elements, the collected information being used to identify the management entity.

For example, BRIGHT and PRASAD, do not disclose or suggest, a network information collector (NIC) configured to identify a management entity associated with one or more network elements required to satisfy a service request, the NIC including a plurality of agents configured to collect information relating to a state of a plurality of network elements, the collected information being used to identify the management entity, as recited in claim 20. The Examiner relies on Fig.1 and col. 11, lines 30-35 of PRASAD for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, p. 7). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of PRASAD.

Col. 11, lines 30-35 of PRASAD, which describe item 112 of Fig. 1, disclose:

10. The directory-enabled service selection system responds with the user and service information. Directory-enabled service selection system uses group membership, role occupancy and authorization information to generate this list.

This section of PRASAD discloses that the directory-enabled service selections system looks up user information in a directory. This section of PRASAD does not disclose or suggest the use of network elements required to satisfy a service request. Therefore, this section of PRASAD cannot disclose or suggest a network information collector (NIC) configured to identify a management entity associated with one or more network elements required to satisfy a service request, the NIC including a plurality of agents configured to collect information relating to a state of a plurality of network elements, the collected information being used to identify the management entity, as recited in claim 20.

Furthermore, the Examiner admits that PRASAD does not disclose that the NIC includes a plurality of agents configured to collect information relating to a state of a plurality of network elements, the collected information being used to identify the management entity (Office Action, p. 7). The Examiner relies on BRIGHT for disclosing this aspect of the feature and alleges (Office Action, p. 7):

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Bright and Prasad to provide the system of Prasad a plurality of agents to collect information from different services, therefore providing different services to the users.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Furthermore, it is unclear how one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to incorporate elements 211-221 from Fig. 2 of BRIGHT (which the Examiner alleged correspond to the agents as recited in claim 20 (Office Action, p. 7)) into directory enabled service selection system 112 from Fig. 1 of PRASAD (which the Examiner alleged correspond to the NIC as recited in claim 20). Item 112 from Fig. 1 of PRASAD looks up information pertaining to a user's subscription in a directory. Items 211-221 from Fig. 2 of BRIGHT are protocol gateways that contact different servers. Item 112 from Fig. 1 of PRASAD is directed to an unrelated function from items 211-221 from Fig. 2 of BRIGHT. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner explain how such an alleged combination would function.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 20 is patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on BRIGHT and PRASAD be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 21 and 23-26 depend from claim 20. Therefore, these claims are patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 21 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on BRIGHT and PRASAD be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Moreover, these claims are patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD for reasons of their own. For example, claim 24 recites features similar to, yet possible of different

scope than, features recited in claim 5. Therefore, claim 24 is patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD for at least the additional reasons set forth above with respect to claim 5.

Independent claim 34 recites features similar to, yet possible of different scope than, features recited in claim 13. Therefore, claim 34 is patentable over BRIGHT and PRASAD for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on BRIGHT and PRASAD be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over BRIGHT in view of PRASAD, and further in view of ALBERT. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 2-3 depends from claim 1. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claims 2-3, Applicants submit that ALBERT does not overcome the deficiencies of BRIGHT and PRASAD set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, these claims are patentable over BRIGHT, PRASAD, and ALBERT for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on BRIGHT, PRASAD and ALBERT be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 22 depends from claim 20. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claim 22, Applicants submit that ALBERT does not overcome the deficiencies of BRIGHT and PRASAD set forth above with respect to claim 20. Therefore, these claims are patentable over BRIGHT, PRASAD, and ALBERT for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 20. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully request that the rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on BRIGHT, PRASAD and ALBERT be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 27 and 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over PRASAD in view of DOSHI. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 27 is directed to a method of resolving a resolution request to identify a management resource. The method includes receiving a resolution request that includes an identification of a subscriber, performing a resolution process that specifies an ordering of functions required to satisfy the resolution request, selecting resolvers designed to perform the functions specified in the resolution process, and controlling the resolvers to perform the functions specified in the resolution process. PRASAD and DOSHI do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, PRASAD and DOSHI do not disclose or suggest performing a resolution process that specifies an ordering of functions required to satisfy the resolution request, as recited in claim 27. The Examiner relies on Fig. 4A of PRASAD for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, p. 13). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of PRASAD.

Fig. 4A of PRASAD was described above as disclosing a process for carrying out a logon process. Fig. 4A does not disclose or suggest specifying an ordering of functions required to satisfy a resolution request. The steps in Fig. 4A are predetermined and are not changed based on different resolution requests. Therefore, Fig. 4A of PRASAD

cannot disclose or suggest performing a resolution process that specifies an ordering of functions required to satisfy the resolution request, as recited in claim 27.

Applicants submit that DOSHI does not overcome the deficiencies of PRASAD set forth above with respect to claim 27.

With regard to motivation, the Examiner alleges (Office Action, p. 13):

Prasad does not explicitly disclose: selecting resolvers designed to perform the functions specified in the resolution process; However, Doshi discloses: selecting resolvers designed to perform the functions specified in the resolution process (p. 3, [0034] lines 4-9, minimizing cost of triangle routing, and call legs in the service selection process)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Prasad and Doshi to minimize resource cost in the process of service selection of Prasad.

DOSHI is directed to an optimized gateway selection process. The section of DOSHI relied on by the Examiner above is directed to minimizing the cost of triangle routing. It is unclear how this method could be incorporated into the process shown in Fig. 4A of PRASAD, which discloses a method of carrying out a service logon. The two methods are not related.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submit that claim 27 is patentable over PRASAD and DOSHI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on PRASAD and DOSHI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 29-33 depend from claim 27. Therefore, these claims are patentable over PRASAD and DOSHI for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on BRIGHT and PRASAD be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Moreover, these claims are patentable over PRASAD and DOSHI for reasons of their own. For example, claim 29 recites features similar to, yet possible of different scope than, features recited in claim 5. While not acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claim 29, Applicants submit that DOSHI does not overcome the deficiencies of PRASAD set forth above with respect to claim 5. Therefore, claim 29 is patentable over PRASAD and DOSHI for at least the additional reasons set forth above with respect to claim 5.

Claim 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over PRASAD in view of DOSHI, and further in view of ALBERT. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 28 depends from claim 27. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claim 28, Applicants submit that ALBERT does not overcome the deficiencies of PRASAD and DOSHI set forth above with respect to claim 27. Therefore, this claim is patentable over PRASAD, DOSHI, and ALBERT for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on PRASAD, DOSHI and ALBERT be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Viktor Simkovic, Reg. No. 56,012/
Viktor Simkovic
Registration No. 56,012

Date: December 21, 2007

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800 main
(571) 432-0899 direct
Customer Number: 44987